

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

ANTONIO BANKS, ) 4:10CV3162  
Petitioner, )  
v. ) **MEMORANDUM  
AND ORDER**  
ROBERT HOUSTON, and STATE OF )  
NEBRASKA, )  
Respondents.

This matter is before the court on its own motion. On September 2, 2011, the court granted Petitioner's Motion for a Stay and Abeyance, which allowed Petitioner to pursue his state-court remedies in the Nebraska state courts. (Filing No. [27](#).) Petitioner advised in his last status report, dated October 15, 2013, that the state district court denied his motion for post-conviction relief on August 5, 2013, and his appeal of the state district court's decision was pending before the Nebraska Court of Appeals. (Filing No. [37](#).) Because this case remains pending, it is necessary for Plaintiff to update the court as to the status of the state-court proceedings.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. Petitioner is directed to file a status report in this matter within 14 days of this Memorandum and Order. The status report must advise the court of the status of Petitioner's pursuit of state-court remedies.

2. The clerk's office is directed to set a pro se case management deadline in this case using the following text: June 27, 2014: deadline for Petitioner to file status report regarding state-court action. In addition, the clerk's office is directed to set a pro se case management deadline in this case using the following text: September 15, 2014: Check on status of Petitioner's case.

DATED this 12<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2014.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Joseph F. Bataillon  
United States District Judge

---

\*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.